February 23, 2007

VIA ECFS - CG Docket No. 06-181

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary Federal Communications Commission Office of the Secretary 445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

Bingham McCutchen LLP 2020 K Street NW Washington, DC 20006-1806

> 202.373.6000 202.373.6001 fax

> > bingham.com

Boston
Hartford
London
Los Angeles
New York
Orange County
San Francisco
Silicon Valley
Tokyo
Walnut Creek
Washington

In re: Closed Captioning and Video Description of Video Programming

— Implementation of Section 305 of the Telecommunications Act of
1996 – Video Programming Accessibility

<u>CGB-CC-0630</u> – Comments on the Petition for Exemption from Closed Captioning Requirements Filed by True Success Christian Fellowship

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc. ("TDI"), National Association for the Deaf ("NAD"), Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumer Advocacy Network ("DHHCAN"), Hearing Loss Association of America ("HLAA"), Association of Late-Deafened Adults, Inc. ("ALDA"), American Association of People with Disabilities ("AAPD"), and California Coalition of Agencies Serving the Deaf and Hard of Hearing ("CCASDHH") (collectively, "Commenters") submit for filing in the above-captioned proceeding their opposition to the petition for exemption from the Commission's closed captioning requirements filed by True Success Christian Fellowship (the "Petition").

The following is a summary of pertinent program, financial, and other information provided in the Petition:

Weekly ½ hour Sunday worship service; aired on CW network; "designed to reach those who do not know Christ . . . those seeking a church home"; produced by G2 Productions; production cost of \$600 per episode; estimates CC costs \$999 per month; "beyond our budget"; production cost \$400 per week; air time costs \$600 per month; "Funds would have to be diverted from other ministry areas"; CC assistance not available from station. Includes affidavit and partial 2005 tax return showing revenue of \$8,291 for May-August. No other financial information.

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary CGB-CC-0630 February 23, 2007 Page 2

Bingham McCutchen IIP

Bingham McCutchen LLP

bingham.com

The Petition does not meet the statutory requirements necessary to support an exemption from the closed captioning rules.¹ Commenters believe that the Petitioner has provided information that suggests that compliance with the closed captioning requirements would impose an undue burden under the Commission's existing waiver standards.² Commenters recommend that the Petitioner be given a temporary exemption of two (2) years to comply with the closed captioning rules.

I. The Legal Standard for Granting a Petition for Exemption

Section 713 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the "Act"), requires that video programming be closed captioned, regardless of distribution technologies, to ensure that it is accessible to persons with hearing disabilities.³ The Commission has the authority to grant a petition for an exemption from the closed captioning requirements upon a showing that the requirements would impose an undue burden on the video programming provider or video owner.⁴ Congress defined "undue burden" to mean "significant difficulty or expense."⁵

A petition seeking a waiver of the captioning rules must demonstrate that compliance would result in an undue burden within the meaning of Section 713(e) and Section 79.1(f) of the Commission's rules. Section 713 requires the Commission to consider four factors when determining whether the closed captioning requirements will impose an undue burden: (1) the nature and cost of the closed captions for the programming; (2) the impact on the operation of the

⁴⁷ U.S.C. § 613(e).

Although Commenters believe that the Petitioner may meet the undue burden standard set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 613(e) and 47 C.F.R. § 79.1(f), the Commission may not properly rely on the *Anglers Exemption Order* to determine whether Petitioner's request meets the undue burden standard. *In the Matter of Anglers for Christ Ministries, Inc.; New Beginning Ministries; Video Programming Accessibility; Petitions for Exemption from Closed Captioning Requirements,* Memorandum Opinion and Order, DA 06-1802 (2006) ("*Anglers Exemption Order*"). The *Anglers Exemption Order* is not a final order and the new standard fails to incorporate an "economically burdensome" or an "undue burden" standard as mandated by 47 U.S.C. § 613(e). *See* Application for Review of Bureau Order, Docket No. 06-181, CGB-CC-0005, CGB-CC-0007 (filed October 12, 2006).

³ 47 U.S.C. § 613(e).

⁴ *Id*.

 $^{^{\}circ}$ Id

⁶ 47 U.S.C. § 613(e); 47 C.F.R. § 79.1(f).

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary CGB-CC-0630 February 23, 2007 Page 3

provider or program owner; (3) the financial resources of the provider or program owner; and (4) the type of operations of the provider or program owner.⁷

Bingham McCutchen IIP

Bingham McCutchen LLP

bingham.com

Section 79.1(f) of the Commission's rules sets forth the Commission's procedures for seeking an exemption from the closed captioning requirements on the basis that compliance would impose an undue burden on the programmer. A petition for an exemption from the closed captioning requirements must be supported by sufficient evidence to demonstrate that compliance with the requirements would cause an undue burden. Such petition must contain a detailed, full showing, supported by affidavit, of any facts or considerations relied on by the petitioner. It must also describe any available alternatives that might constitute a reasonable substitute for the captioning requirements.

In the 2006 Anglers Exemption Order, the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau ("CGB") improperly created a new standard that ignored the "undue burden" analysis required by the Act, the Commission's rules, and Commission precedent. Instead, the CGB stated that any non-profit organization may be granted a waiver from the closed captioning rules if the organization does not receive compensation for airing its programming and if it may terminate or substantially curtail its programming or other activities important to its mission if it is required to caption its programming.¹² The Commission may not properly rely on the Anglers Exemption Order to determine whether Petitioner's request meets the undue burden standard. Commenters have sought review of the Anglers Exemption Order by the Commission and, accordingly, the Anglers Exemption Order is not final.¹³ Moreover, the standard announced by the CGB in the Anglers Exemption Order was inappropriate because it failed to incorporate an "economically burdensome" or an "undue burden" standard as mandated by the Act and fails to require Petitioner to demonstrate the four factors listed above.

^{&#}x27; Id.

⁸ 47 C.F.R. § 79.1(f).

⁹ 47 C.F.R. § 79.1(f)(2).

¹⁰ 47 C.F.R. § 79.1(f)(9).

¹¹ 47 C.F.R. § 79.1(f)(3).

¹² In the Matter of Anglers for Christ Ministries, Inc.; New Beginning Ministries; Video Programming Accessibility; Petitions for Exemption from Closed Captioning Requirements, Memorandum Opinion and Order, DA 06-1802 (2006) ("Anglers Exemption Order").

¹³ See Application for Review of Bureau Order, Docket No. 06-181, CGB-CC-0005, CGB-CC-0007 (filed October 12, 2006).

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary CGB-CC-0630 February 23, 2007 Page 4

Bingham McCutchen IIP

Bingham McCutchen LLP

bingham.com

The Petitioner also should not be granted an exemption simply because a portion of its revenue is derived from charitable contributions. It is well-established that charitable and religious organizations are not automatically exempted from the Commission's rules. The Commission recently reaffirmed this position, stating that any group, including any religious group, that "subjects itself to public interest obligations" must comply with the FCC rules. Because Petitioner produces programming that is broadcast to the public, it must comply with the closed captioning obligations unless it satisfies the undue burden standard.

II. Conclusion

Commenters believe that the Petitioner has provided information that suggests that compliance with the closed captioning requirements would in fact impose an undue burden under the Commission's existing waiver standards. As such, Commenters recommend that the Petitioner be given a temporary exemption of two (2) years to comply with the closed captioning rules.

In addition, Commenters respectfully request that the Commission accept the attached certification that the facts and considerations in this filing are true and correct and waive the requirement to provide an affidavit for a responsive pleading.¹⁵

Respectfully submitted,

/ s /

Paul O. Gagnier Troy F. Tanner Danielle C. Burt Bingham McCutchen LLP 2020 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20007

Counsel to TDI

¹⁴ In the Matter of Greenwood Acres Baptist Church Licensee of AM Broadcast Station KASO located in Minden, Louisiana, Memorandum Opinion and Order, DA 07-322 (EB 2007).

¹⁵ 47 C.F.R. §79.1(f)(9).

Bingham McCutchen LLP bingham.com

Claude L. Stout Executive Director Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc. 8630 Fenton Street, Suite 604 Silver Spring, MD 20910

_____/ s /____

/ s /____

Nancy J. Bloch Chief Executive Officer National Association of the Deaf 8630 Fenton Street, Suite 820 Silver Spring, MD 20190-4500

____/ s /____

Cheryl Heppner Vice Chair Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumer Advocacy Network 3951 Pender Drive, Suite 130 Fairfax, VA 22030

____/ s /____

Brenda Battat Associate Executive Director Hearing Loss Association of America 7910 Woodmont Avenue, Suite 1200 Bethesda, MD 20814 <u>/ s /</u>

Edgar Palmer
President
Association of Late-Deafened Adults, Inc. 8038 Macintosh Lane
Rockford, IL 61107

/ s /_____

Jenifer Simpson Senior Director, Telecommunications and Technology Policy American Association of People with Disabilities 1629 K Street N.W., Suite 503 Washington, DC 20006

<u>/ s</u>

Ed Kelly Chair California Coalition of Agencies Serving the Deaf and Hard of Hearing 6022 Cerritos Avenue Cypress, CA 90630

CERTIFICATION

I, <u>Rosaline Crawford</u>, <u>Director</u>, <u>NAD Law and Advocacy Center</u>, hereby certify that to the extent there are any facts or considerations not already in the public domain which have been relied on in the attached Opposition to the Petition for Exemption from Closed Captioning Requirements, these facts and considerations are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Date: February 23, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Danielle Burt, do hereby certify that, on February 23, 2007, a copy of the foregoing Opposition to the Petition for Exemption from Closed Captioning Requirements Filed by True Success Christian Fellowship as filed with the Federal Communications Commission in CGB-CC-0630, was served by first class U.S. mail, postage prepaid, upon the Petitioner:

Glenn D. Zimmerman True Success Christian Fellowship 3379 Watchman Drive Montgomery, AL 36116

anulli But
Danielle Burt